

S P E E C H

O F T H E

HON. WM. SAWYER, OF OHIO,

1803 - 1877

O N T H E

O R E G O N Q U E S T I O N.

D E L I V E R E D

I N T H E H O U S E O F R E P R E S E N T A T I V E S ,

F E B R U A R Y 3, 1846.

W A S H I N G T O N :

P R I N T E D A T T H E U N I O N O F F I C E

1 8 4 6 .

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from

This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Libraries

S P E E C H.

In the resolution giving the twelve months' notice for the termination of the joint occupancy of the Oregon territory.

Mr. SAWYER obtained the floor, and, having left his usual seat at the right of the Speaker, and passed over, taking an unoccupied place at the speaker's left, which is the whig portion of the house, he addressed the committee.

I have come, Mr. Chairman, to locate myself over here in British Oregon. If you will fancy the Columbia river passing down the main aisle, you will observe I take my stand on the north side of that river, right in the centre of the British settlements; and here I plant myself under the constitution and laws of my country, and here I intend to remain regardless of consequences. I discover, Mr. Chairman, that a good many of the settlers here have dispersed, (referring to several vacant seats around me,) which I conceive to be a good sign—an evidence of a consciousness of a want of sound title. They have gone away and vacated these farms, and in the name of my country I take possession of them, and I intend to keep possession. I wish, then, to be distinctly understood to assert our right the whole of Oregon up to 54° 40'; and I am not willing to relinquish one iota of it. My reasons for this claim are not based upon any formal treaty stipulations whatever. It is a right founded upon a higher authority than any human compact.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. WINDROP,] who spoke in the early part of this debate, asked very significantly where we find our title to this territory, and whether it may not be found in the corner of Adam's will? No; it dates further back—long before Adam's dust was fashioned into man; our title dates with the creation of the world. We received it from high Heaven—from destiny, if you please. In the course of events, in the progress and consummation of this destiny, Christopher Columbus was sent across the ocean to examine this country, and he found that it was good for man to dwell upon. By-and-by, our fathers followed and took possession; here they established the seat of empire; here they sowed the seeds of democracy, which sprang up and brought forth abundance of excellent fruit. But the prosperity of this country has excited the jealousy and fears of another people, and they sent armies to subjugate it to their own will and control. Then arose one George Washington, who drove the invaders from the land, and located his family upon it. Columbus and

Washington were but the agents Heaven employed to place us in possession of our own. This is our claim of title, and I can see no defect in it. I contend it is good and sufficient against all other claimants. This island—or, if you prefer to call it so, this continent—was made and set apart for our especial benefit. We have a right to every inch of it, and it would be ingratitude to high Heaven to surrender a single pebble.

I have been trying for two or three weeks past occasionally to get the floor, but, being a modest man, I do not like to enter into the contest with so much noise and clatter as I see sometimes employed to obtain this floor; other causes, too, have operated to exclude me. One of them is this system of explaining speeches whose meaning is so uncertain that these commentaries seem to be in continued demand; thus the morning hour is consumed in petty crimination and recrimination. I do not expect to consume my hour, and I have tried for the last two or three days to get the floor to move that a half hour only hereafter be allowed to gentlemen who speak on this question. Well, I hope this may be proposed hereafter and adopted, as I discover there are certain other qualities besides talents requisite to get the floor and to obtain ascendancy in this House.

[Here Mr. S. was interrupted by some one asking what other qualities he meant? To which Mr. S. replied, impudence.]

I may be compelled, Mr. Chairman, from the necessity of the case, after I have been here a while, to adopt the same course which I see here pursued with so much success. I have a constituency as independent as I profess to be, and they expect me to have my rights, and I will have them, even though I should have to stoop to an imitation of the example set by some gentlemen in their efforts to be heard.

There are divers ways now proposed by gentlemen on this floor, whereby the Oregon question may be settled. Of some of these I will speak hereafter. I will not undertake to argue the constitutional question, because certain gentlemen might say, as was said in olden times, that a blacksmith was not a proper person to mend watches, and a farmer had no business to lay his huge paws on the statute-book. For this reason, and for the more substantial reason, that it appears already to have received the

fullest elucidation from powerful and competent minds, I shall say nothing upon this part of the question. I shall, therefore, mainly confine myself to replies to gentlemen who have espoused the British cause in this dispute.

The word "war" has been dwelt upon in all its horrible phases, with great emphasis and eloquence, by certain gentlemen, until many seem to be frightened from a performance of their duty by the "grim visaged" picture. Whether these gentlemen are prompted by cowardice or selfishness in their denunciations I am not able to say, nor do I conceive it to be very important, as either motive is sufficiently detestable in itself. But neither shall have any weight with me in the arguments which I shall use, nor in the conclusion to which I shall come. I do not care one cent whether England declare war against us or not; no, not one cent. I believe we are right, and that is enough to govern my action. I look no further. If evils grow out of a sturdy maintenance of our rights, then let them fall upon the guilty heads! Honest democrats have nothing to fear from this malediction.

The gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. LEAKE,] who occupied the floor this morning, takes to task some of the gentlemen of the democratic party, who have heretofore advocated the policy of giving the notice, for their votes on this question at the last session of Congress, and accuses them of inconsistency—forgetting, it would seem, that truthful old adage, "Circumstances alter cases." I will undertake to show you and that gentleman how it is, and why it was, that they voted against this measure at that time; and I shall do it by quoting from the speech of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. WINTHROP,] who spoke in the early part of this debate. The arguments herein adduced appear to have been those which governed the action of Congress at that time; and whether the sequel has proved them correct or not, as things then were, they appear to have been dictated by prudence and good policy; and most certainly, considering the aspect of affairs at that time, these gentlemen were fully justifiable in the course they then pursued; but to the extract. The gentleman whom I quote proceeds to say:

"Indeed, sir, this whole proceeding is, in my judgment, eminently calculated to impede and embarrass the negotiations in which the two governments are employed. We have received authentic assurances that these negotiations have not yet failed; that they are still in progress; and that a communication in regard to them may be expected from the Executive before the close of the present session. Why not wait for this communication? Why insist on taking any steps in the dark when in a few weeks, at the most, we shall be able to act advisedly, and to see clearly the ground on which we are treading?"

That, sir, was the reason urged then by that gentleman, and by several others, why we should not give the notice, and proceed to extend our laws and institutions fully over the whole territory—because negotiations were going on, and because a new President had just been elected in whom the people had full confidence, and to whom even they knew this business could be safely entrusted; and that it was but a mark of respect to allow him to pursue these negotiations further, in the hope that it were possible he might bring them to a favorable termination. And with this view many persons voted against taking any steps which might throw difficulties in the way of the pending negotiations. A little further on this same gentleman passes a eulogy upon a certain distinguished individual, now in the other branch of our national legislature:

"Mr. Webster has dared to preserve the peace of the country by abating something of our extreme territorial claims on the northeast, and he has earned the gratitude of all good citizens in doing so."

I rather suspect, sir, that the people of Maine will not desire to earn the epithet of "good citizens" by cherishing grateful feelings for this abatement of their "extreme territorial claims." There is too much patriotism in their hearts to feel grateful for this surrender of their soil and rights. Such a sentiment is foreign to that love of country and of justice so characteristic of the American heart, and is degrading and disgraceful to the American name.

But, Mr. Chairman, the arguments which were all-powerful at the last session of Congress are not so now; circumstances have changed, and with this change, the whole aspect of this question. Then there was a possibility, a reasonable hope, that this question could be amicably settled by negotiation. Now we have the message of the President of the United States, and we have the correspondence between Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Calhoun, and the British minister on this subject; and from these authentic sources we learn that no further negotiations will be had in relation to this matter. They have long since ceased; and we are now fully convinced that nothing can be expected from that mode of adjustment. How, then, stands the case? what course does it now become necessary for us to pursue? I can see but one which is likely to secure the desired end. Why, even these very gentlemen who oppose the passage of this resolution with so much zeal and fury, are willing that we should take possession up to 49° ; and yet they are afraid of war if we give the notice. Well, I put this question to the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. BAYLY,] who spoke a few days ago, and whose speech has been the subject of much severe criticism in this hall. He is willing to sustain our claims up to 49° , and to pass the notice to that effect. Now, let me ask him, where is the offer of Great Britain to assent to this compromise? She has never made any offer of the kind, but has uniformly refused to accede to such a proposition. We have offered 49° , but she refused it. And yet gentlemen, who are so easily alarmed at the prospect of war if we should assert our just claims to the whole of Oregon, are willing to enforce them to a portion as obstinately claimed by England as that north of the 49th degree. It appears, then, that these gentlemen are willing to endanger the peace of the two countries for a small portion of the territory, when the taking possession of the whole could produce no worse consequences. I contend that we may as well fight for a whole loaf as a crumb. It would seem, then, that these gentlemen's only object is to "abate something of our extreme territorial claims on the northwest," and therefore confine in as narrow limits as possible the action of our glorious institutions.

[Mr. LEAKE was understood to say that he was not for the notice, whether we took after it up to 49° , or to $54^{\circ} 40'$.]

Mr. SAWYER continued. Well, some of the gentlemen have been in favor of the notice, and for assuming jurisdiction to some extent—willing to give the notice, and take forcible possession up to 49° . Does not the same difficulty arise here as if we took up to $54^{\circ} 40'$? It must; or else the English will back out; and if you go to fighting for it from the mouth of the Columbia to 49° , might you not as well include the whole, and fight for it? I think so.

If we believe the country to be ours, let us take possession of it, and let us defend and keep it at all hazards.

Sir, there is a branch of the subject I shall now proceed to notice, and which I think worthy of attentive consideration. The gentleman from Virginia—the “lone star,” (referring to Mr. PENDLETON)—employs the very same language in reference to the Oregon country used by the old federal party in its better days, in relation to other parts of the country, which have now become the homes of prosperous millions—I mean the country included within the Louisiana purchase, now forming the flourishing States of Louisiana, Missouri, and Arkansas, and other valuable territory. What was then the objection to the acquisition of that extensive region? Why it was then said it was worth nothing, as the gentleman now says of the Oregon territory.

[Mr. PENDLETON was understood to inquire by whom it was said that the Louisiana purchase was worth nothing:]

Mr. SAWYER. I did not propose to go into a full history of that purchase. I merely mention this fact to show how much old federalism and young federalism are alike, and how well versed in the arguments of the former are the friends of the latter. But I will tell you a little more of the language used in reference to this great and important measure. It was said there were alligators enough on the land to fence it, and that the land itself was not worth having. And the gentleman now says of Oregon that it is not worth the paper upon which the bill is printed; and I take it that the gentleman who uses the same language in relation to Oregon territory now, *belongs to the same party* that made this declaration in reference to the Louisiana purchase and to Florida. That was the language used in times gone by in relation to the acquisition of valuable territory; that is the language used now, and it will be the language used by that party whenever we attempt to erect new States, or organize or acquire new territories, where our freeborn sons can find a field of promise for their industry and enterprise. New countries are the natural birth-places of free thoughts and noble sentiments; here, there is no sycophancy, no base cringing to superior wealth or power. And I am led to suspect that the strongest reason, though not openly avowed, which actuates certain gentlemen in this opposition to the measure now under discussion, is that the territory in question will soon form a little galaxy of democratic States. All our new States are democratic. It well accords with the intrepid spirit of the true democrat to encounter and conquer the difficulties which new and fertile regions present, and to turn to usefulness their idle rivers and slumbering soil. Well, sir, Oregon is of immense value to us, and it matters not whether we fight for it now or hereafter. I prefer to bear a portion of the burden myself. I prefer leaving to my children and posterity a clear title, free from all incumbrance; and, Mr. Chairman, if an assertion of our rights, and the taking possession of our own, are to be followed by a declaration of war by England, I, for one, say let it come. I do not fear the consequences of a war with that power, and shall myself be found among the foremost in defense of my country, not in words only but in acts.

I have said, and I now repeat it, that I will vote for his resolution even should it have the tendency which some gentlemen contend it will have of hastening a rupture with Great Britain; and the very moment England declares war I will resign my seat

on this floor, and take my stand among my constituents to fight for my own fireside and my country's rights. I stand pledged to do it, and I will do it. It matters not when this war comes; for come it must, if you give the British possession all around us. How stands the case now? Go to your eastern seaboard, and you will find her possessions all around you; and she is now trying to encircle you on the west.

In this manner we have given England every power to cripple and annoy us; and it is our own fault that she now enjoys these facilities. She is endeavoring to widen her possessions and strengthen her power at those very points which will render her most troublesome. I have called this continent an island; and, though it is a pretty large one, we need it all, and must have it. Our safety and security demand it; our interests demand it; the cause of humanity demands it; and the growth of democratic principles demand it; and these demands shall and must be complied with. Great Britain would find great trouble in disturbing us three thousand miles off—as, in her proper sphere, she is—if she had no possessions upon this little island of ours; but having so many possessions all around us, and in our immediate neighborhood, she has resting places where she can run in for supplies, refit her ships, and even build them. She can thus supply herself with all the means necessary to a protracted and disastrous war. Are we not, then, most culpable for permitting such a state of things to continue? Shall we support a policy that will ultimately exclude the British power from the continent, or one that will encourage her to extend it? I fear that some gentlemen are willing to give her a footing on the northwest coast, and in such manner as to enable her to give us great trouble hereafter, by adding immensely to her present great means of annoyance. A gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PENDLETON] has said that Great Britain has never done any wrong or injury to this country which she has not repaired or apologized for.

Mr. PENDLETON. I did not say that. I said that Great Britain had done no injury to this country which she had not atoned for.

Mr. SAWYER continued, and said that this was a matter of veracity between him and the gentleman from Virginia. He said that Great Britain has done no injury she has not atoned for. I say she has done much injury, and has never atoned for it. A long list of injuries were charged in the declaration of independence, and I undertake to say that these injuries still remain unatoned for. Many of the charges brought against her by this country heretofore are still subjects of complaint now. Some of these matters of complaint were particularly mentioned the other day by my colleague, [Mr. THURMAN,] not one of which has ever been atoned for. He spoke of the burning of the Caroline; but I wish to call the attention of this House to another and more grievous charge—to wit: that the Indian hostilities which we have long been obliged to encounter are instigated by England. Thousands of pounds every year are appropriated by Great Britain for largesses for the Indians; and it is well understood that the object of this liberality is to secure their friendship to herself, and to incite them to hostilities against the people of the United States. Great Britain makes her annual payments to the Indians as regularly as we make appropriations for the support of our government, for the express purpose of securing the confidence and good will of

the Indians, and to destroy the good understanding which would otherwise exist between them and us. The influence thus obtained over the Indians is frequently manifested by the most damnable atrocities committed upon our people. The endeavors of the British to break the friendship between the Indians and the people of this country have so far succeeded, that it requires a large sum annually to counteract this base influence, and to secure our peace with them. Being myself a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I have taken some pains to ascertain the facts, and I find that British interference in this matter costs us about one million of dollars annually. Our frontiers have long been exposed to the most cruel outrages, where men, women, and children have suffered, not only by being made captives, but by being given up to savage torture and murder. The British officers themselves, after the battle of the River Raisin, were compelled by the Indians to surrender American citizens to the demands of savage fury, to be tortured, and finally burnt at the stake; and this, sir, was never atoned for; and I will tell you, sir, that the American people will never rest satisfied, after these inhumanities, until they have a chance to "draw a bead" upon such foes. I may, perhaps, feel more sensibly on this point, when I consider the wrongs and injuries which my father suffered while a prisoner to the British and Indians during the late war. It was owing to the inhuman treatment which he received at the hands of his captors, that he is now a cripple, and unable to pursue any of the ordinary vocations of life. His whole life from that period to the present time has been one of constant bodily suffering; night brings him no relief, day dawns upon no hope. I swear by the Eternal God, that if my life is spared, and opportunities occur, I will make an Englishman's life pay for every hour of suffering which my father has endured at their hands! I myself am determined, my constituents are determined, and, I believe, the American people are determined, to avenge these injuries which the English have inflicted upon us, but have never yet atoned for. Why, sir, has she not twice brought her whole power upon us to crush our independence? After the revolutionary war she let us alone for awhile, but was continually violating our rights as a nation, and insulting our flag on every sea, until " forbearance ceased to be a virtue." Notwithstanding all our pacific measures and remonstrances against these violations, her aggression only became the more common and insulting, and we were finally compelled to declare war against her. Again she came across the waters, boasting of her power and will to annihilate our nationality, and though she was bravely repelled, she managed to destroy a few small villages, and rob the unfortunate inhabitants—a mode of warfare the most contemptible at all times, and particularly unworthy a magnanimous nation. These acts of rapine and plunder she has never atoned for. And now, because, forsooth, we are not ready to give up territory which actually belongs to us, there are some gentlemen in this House who undertake to say that we are doing injustice to Great Britain, and attempt to apologize for our course on this floor. Why, sir, the moment that Great Britain takes any hostile position towards this country a third time, ten thousand swords will leap from their scabbards, and a million of rifles will be taken down from the pegs on which they hang, and a million of freemen will

fearlessly march to the field of battle; the remembrance of wrongs too long unavenged, and the high courage which freemen fighting for their country alone can know, will inspire them with a desire for the conflict, and a determination to crush the perfidious and insulting foe.

Mr. PENDLETON here rose and said that if the gentleman would give him leave, he would ask him now to place him (Mr. P.) in a proper position as to the remark the gentleman had made about a question of veracity between himself and the gentleman; he wished the gentleman to explain that it was not a question of veracity, but merely one of inference..

Mr. SAWYER continued. I did not intend anything personal. I will repeat that I understood the gentleman to say that England had atoned or apologized for every outrage she had committed upon us. I say she has not done so; and have pointed out instances in proof of this assertion. If any gentleman can show that England has atoned for these injuries, I will yield the point. She has, from the very earliest settlement of our forefathers in this country, continually made us the objects of her oppressions and malevolence; her demands have always been extravagant and unreasonable, and her conduct towards us imperious and illiberal. Why, sir, England claims Canada, but she has no right to it, as I shall show before I get through my remarks. I started, sir, in these remarks with the proposition that we have an exclusive right to the whole of this island for the purpose of making an experiment of the adaptation of democratic principles to the wants and happiness of man. I contend, sir, that this American continent belongs exclusively to the people of the United States.

We were a colony dependent on Great Britain when we conquered Canada in the war of 1745; this we did before we were an independent nation, and all the rights which Great Britain now has in Canada were obtained through us. Canada was conquered by our valor and our means. Even Virginia contributed to it; therefore I have said that Great Britain has no right to it, and that it belongs to our people who originally conquered it from the French and Indians. I will put a case to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SIMS] which he will understand. I will suppose this whole continent to be but one great farm. (Yes, said Mr. SIMS, I understand that perfectly.) I propose, then, that this farm be occupied only by American farmers. (I subscribe to that, said Mr. SIMS.) What farmer of common sense will undertake to make his crop of corn, or wheat, or what not, without first going to work to extirpate the weeds and briars? But here we have Canada, Nova Scotia, and other British possessions around us which are tares among our wheat. These are the weeds and briars which I would have rooted out. They prevent the spread of our principles, and circumscribe the blessings of our govermental experiment. It is time we were rid of these obstructions to the progress of free institutions. Their baneful and corrupting influence is but too sensibly felt and too manifestly evident to escape the observation of even the most superficial. We must remove this influence. Our people are increasing in numbers, and we need for our enterprising sons and daughters every foot of territory thus encumbered by the tools and slaves of aristocratic power.

The moment that England, or any foreign power opposed to our system, obtains a foothold on our

soil with our permission, we lend a club to break our own heads with. What would Great Britain say if we got a foothold on her island, and put our institutions into operation there? We have just as good a right to do it, as she had to establish her institutions here. Would she permit such a thing for a moment? No; our principles are so different that they must produce a perpetual collision, and we must drive out from our land all governments founded upon antagonistical principles. The country is merely large enough to enable us to make the republican experiment that we have endeavored to make.

A gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Rockwell] has told us that the shipping interest will greatly suffer in the event of war; and he read to us several letters from ship-owners on the subject, advising us not to give the notice, because the shipping interest would be greatly injured by it. I admit his position to be true, that the shipping interest will, in one sense, be subject to detriment. I also admit what the gentleman from S. C. [Mr. HOLMES] has told us of the danger of the destruction of New York, and Charleston, and other cities on the seaboard; but for the evil that these gentlemen suggest, I will propose a remedy, and it is one that was successfully adopted by an eminent physician in such cases. When Dr. Jackson undertook the defence of New Orleans, a certain cotton merchant came to him and said that his bales of cotton had been taken for the purpose of making breastworks for the defence of New Orleans, and he wanted immediate payment or restoration, inasmuch as private property could not be taken for public uses without compensation. General Jackson heard his complaint, and told him he would do what was right in the matter, and he pointed out a course that was proper to be pursued in such cases. He sent immediately for a musket and twenty rounds of cartridges.

The poor fellow hearing this order, did not know what was to become of him; but very soon General Jackson put the musket in his hand, and said—"Stand there, sir, and defend your cotton." Thus, General Jackson compelled him to stand up and defend his country. Let all others, who are interested in property, defend it in the same manner, and there is little danger of loss. Why, sir, we have men enough in our Atlantic and other cities to defend successfully every dime's worth of property; and with that as one motive, and their country's welfare for another, who will not bravely meet the storm? If there is one man, the sooner his property and himself are destroyed the better. This paltry question of dollars and cents should have no weight when national honor and national territory are at stake. Must the private interest of a few individuals preponderate over those of the nation at large? I shall regret as much as any one that individual loss shall arise from any action that may seem necessary to the vindication of our rights. But, have we not always made liberal reparation for property destroyed by our enemies in time of war? The whole history of our legislation on this subject proves it. Applications for relief for losses thus sustained are now of daily occurrence.

I will now pay my respects, for a few moments, to the gentleman from Virginia who last spoke, [Mr. LEAKE]. I admit that his was a great speech; and I admit all that the gentleman claims for the Old Dominion. But times change. The time was when Rome was the proud mistress of the world; literature and learning flourished within her walls; the pa-

ges of her history are filled with the names of great men. But, alas! where is she now? Fallen, fallen, fallen! Her greatness has departed. Those who gave her power and fame, and made her the terror and admiration of the earth, have long since returned to the dust; and now the Roman is as degraded and detestable as once he was great and noble. We must now speak of them as "degenerate sons of noble sires." It does not follow, that because Virginia has been the mother of so many presidents that she may not become barren, or give birth only to miserable dwarfs. I fear, indeed, that the spirit and vigor of her womanhood have departed, and that her more recent births are but sorry abortions.

Another gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. BAYLY], has made some remarks, to which I will briefly reply. That gentleman, in the early part of the session, was charged with being a whig by a gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. DAVIS]. I was disposed to resent the charge at first, as being unjustly made upon one of my friends. But now, I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Kentucky, though at first I believed it to be a charge made for the purpose of detracting from the influence and standing of one of my political friends.

Speaking now of Accomac: it is, if I am not mistaken, the district formerly represented by Mr. Wise. Mr. Wise came here a Jackson man, dyed in the wool. He became after a while anti-Jackson, and went back and appealed to his constituents, and they sent him here again; and after a little while he made another somerset, and became a Tyler man; still his constituents, turning a somerset with him, endorsed his new faith, and again returned him to Congress. The gentleman who now represents the same people, has also made a wheel-about or two; for he was in 1840 an advocate of "Tippecanoe and Tyler too," and made whig speeches in my State. When I think of the facility with which the good people of the Accomac district change their tunes to suit new songs—or, in other words, change their principles to suit the caprices of their leaders—it reminds me of the tree-frog, which in my country is very plenty, and instantly changes the color of its skin to suit that of the bark of the tree to which it clings. No doubt these Accomacers, or political tree-frogs, are properly represented on this floor. Some gentlemen here have charged me, and my friends who act with me on this question, with following the lead of the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. ADAMS]. I tell those gentlemen that in making this charge they only show their ignorance of the principles on which the true democrat acts. One gentleman remarked that compliments from a source always unfriendly to that distinguished member, [Mr. ADAMS], could not be considered as praise. But I will say to that gentleman, that in this remark he has shown that he does not understand the true principles of democracy. The time was when the democratic party considered that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ADAMS] was acting wrong, and they censured him accordingly; but this did not prevent them from approving of his course when he acted right. But, sir, you cannot point to a single instance in that gentleman's long public career wherein, in any controversy with a foreign power, and especially with England, he has not taken the side of his own country. Ten thousand times, sir, would I rather follow the lead of that gentleman, than follow a distinguished leader in the other wing of the Capitol, who was once a

Jackson man, and then became a bitter foe to the Old Hero; and not only aided in passing a resolution of censure upon him, but afterwards refused to make reparation for the injury and injustice he had done by expunging the infamous resolution from the journal. Put your finger, sir, on that gentleman, and, like the Irishman's flea, he is not there. He has been in favor of, and against, every administration. I do not doubt that the gentleman from Virginia, as he has said, has been distinguished by many high trusts from the people since he first came into public life, but it is not impossible that they have been deceived; for I doubt whether the germ of democracy was ever planted in him. When he charges us with following the lead of the gentleman from Massachusetts, or of any other man, he speaks for effect—and an effect not very creditable to himself. I will not say of him as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ADAMS] once said of an eminent person at the other end of the Capitol, that after expressing such sentiments he has but one more step to take—and that will carry him over to the enemy.

I have no doubt that the British press will pass high encomiums on the gentleman's speech, as they did on that of a distinguished senator who spoke in Faneuil Hall; but as to my speech, and that of my friend from Missouri, [Mr. SIMS,] and a hundred others, they will receive no favors. The sentiments they breathe, the views they advocate, and the principles they advance, will find no response from British hearts. I very much fear that British interests are not without advocates and friends on this floor; and I fear that the vote upon the question now pending will show the number to be far greater than would seem possible in an American Congress. I will here read from an article headed "The American War Mania," which recently appeared in the "Economist," an English paper, and which pur-

ports to be an extract from a letter written by an American:

" If I could take the same liberty with Sir Robert Peel that I used to do with my personal friends Lords Lansdowne and Monteagle, when they were in office, I should very frankly tell him that the policy of England, in order to preserve peace, is to remain perfectly quiet, and permit the sensible and honest portion of the American people to keep in complete check the dishonest and reckless portion of it. Fortunately for both countries, your Parliament does not meet until February, and therefore Sir Robert Peel cannot be called upon for any public declaration for or against the President's gasconade, until some demonstration has been made in Congress to show the feelings of parties in both houses.

" Of the wickedness of such a war, and of the blessings of a continued peace, I need not enlarge, as they are self-evident to every honest man; but I will say, that should hostilities grow out of such an insignificant cause, the names of those who wilfully occasion it will be transmitted to posterity with no enviable immortality. The merchants, traders, ship-owners, and capitalists of America are opposed to war; the politicians alone are in favor of it. It is, therefore, the more to be desired that no hasty step on the part of the British government should give her foes any advantage over her friends."

The views here expressed by one who calls himself an "American," however base and disgusting to the true patriot, are not so very dissimilar to views advanced by some gentlemen on this floor. But I hope for the honor of my country that this feeling is confined to the breasts of a very few.

Now, sir, in order to carry out our views, and rid this whole continent of British power, we must extend our laws gradually but resolutely over the whole country, till we possess all that nature and nature's God designed for us. Let our government be coextensive with the continent, and the sooner the better; though we meet with wars and difficulties, they can be overcome. And I, for one, will use my best efforts to hand down to posterity, pure and unadulterated, that freedom we received from the fathers of the revolution.